

Amendments and Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims. To further prosecution of this application, Applicants submit the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-22 are currently active in the application. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-11, 13-14, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Muller (US 4,698,542). Claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-14, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Egami (US 4,620,139). Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, and 17-20 stand rejected under USC §102(b) as anticipated by Muller (US 4, 547,714). Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 17, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Hsu (US 6,552,458). Claims 7 and 20 stand rejected as unpatentable under USC §103(a) over Muller (US 4,698,542) in view of Egami (US 4,620,139). Claim 12 stands rejected as unpatentable under USC §103(a) over any one of Muller (US 4,698,542), Egami (US 4,620,139, or Muller (US 4, 547,714) in view of Molnar (US 5,895,994). Claims 4 and 16 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled


Claims 1 and 13 have been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Office Action (Section 8). As claim 1 as amended is a restatement of claim 1 further including the limitation of claim 4 and as claim 13 as amended is a restatement of claim 13 further including the limitation of claim 16, both claims 1 and 13 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-3 and 5-7 dependent from claim 1 and claims 14-15 and 17-20 dependent from claim 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 has been amended to also require that the means for mounting the detecting means be not perpendicular to the arbor. Since the cited art describe a position sensor carried by a printed circuit perpendicular to a support (Egami), a Hall sensor carried by a component board perpendicular to a central holding means (Muller '352), a Hall sensor carried by a circuit board perpendicular to an arbor 31 (Ohiwa), and a galvano-magnetic rotor position sensor carried by a printed circuit on a plate perpendicular to a structural support element (Muller '542), claim 8 is distinguishable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 9-12 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 1 and 13 as amended are duplicates of claims 21 and 22, allowed in the prior June 10, 2004 Office Action. Therefore, as reviewed with the Examiner in a telephone conversation on October 19, 2004, claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after these amendments, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth S. Sachar
Registration No. 54,418
Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02110-1618
(617) 443-9292

Attorney's Docket No.: 917/193
November 15, 2004
00917/00193 338903.1